HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XIV, No. 28 Saturday, July 13, 1957 Washington, D. C.

THE LIBRARY WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

News Section

Printed in Two Sections

HIGH COURT: *Throws a boomerang* (page 1)
RUSSIA: *The pitch on Zhukov* (page 1)
ECONOMY: *Ike cuts spending* (page 2)
CIVIL RIGHTS: *The Negro vote* (page 2)
LABOR: *And the Kennedy boys* (page 3)

The Court Buys Trouble: America's "constitutional crisis" took on a new dimension this week, as the Supreme Court handed Specialist 3/C William S. Girard over to Japanese authorities for trial in the slaying of Mrs. Naka Sakai.

The greatest casualty of this decision, believe legal minds in the Capital, may not be Girard, but the Court itself. Resentment against the "Red Monday" decisions of June 17 has built steadily, crescendoing in demands that the Court's powers be sharply curbed. The Girard decision is putting new steam behind these demands. For the public cannot miss what is termed the "grim paradox" of the Court's position: while the attempts of Communists to subvert and betray their country are protected as "civil liberties," the elementary rights of American GI's are casually bartered away.

American Legion Commander W. C. Daniels, it is said, summed up the issue last week when he stated: "We hope the Supreme Court will be as solicitous of the rights of Girard as it has been of the rights of Communists." That hope — shared by thousands of Americans — has been rudely disappointed. And now, say observers, the Court had better be ready to take the consequences.

For, as the most serious analysts read the signs, the Court now refuses to be bound by any rules whatever — national security, constitutional law, or even simple consistency. The real ruling faction on the Court, as one wag put it, consists of "Justices Whim and Caprice." The only recourse, therefore, is action by Congress to keep the Court within constitutional bounds.

Additionally, the decision is seen as giving impetus to moves to cancel or revise the "Status of Forces" agreements. The widespread hostility toward the Court's decision in the Senate is particularly noted. For it was the Senate which, by a vote of 72-15, originally gave the NATO "Status of Forces" treaty the effect of law. Many of the Senators who voted "yea" are now beset by feelings of guilt. They did not follow the debate with care, they say now, and were swayed by President Eisenhower when he stated — in reply to a question from Senator Knowland (July 14, 1953):

> **"I can certainly appreciate the concern of those who fear that these agreements might subject American soldiers overseas to systems of criminal justice foreign to our own traditions. I do not share such fears, however, because of the many years' experience I had in command of American troops overseas. That experience convinces me that our friends abroad will continue to cooperate, as they have in the past, in turning over those charged with offenses against their laws to our own military courts for trial."**

For Senators who believed this statement, the Girard case has come as an abrupt awakening. Thus many legislators in both chambers are now known to favor action against the "Status of Forces" agreements. Congressman Wint Smith (R.-Kan.) expressed the widespread feeling when he stated to HUMAN EVENTS this week: "This decision is another nail in the Constitution's coffin. It points up the necessity of passing not only the Bow Amendment but also the Bricker Amendment." Congressman August E. Johansen (R.-Mich.), an inveterate foe of the agreements, told HUMAN EVENTS that now "the immediate and urgent practical concern is that there be provided forthwith a barrier sufficiently clear and strong that it cannot possibly be disregarded by any branch of our Government."

What Happened in Russia: Amid the welter of conversation topics in Capitol Hill cloakrooms — filibusters, foreign aid, Hells Canyon, the Supreme Court — one question persists in the talk of all legislators: what *really* happened in the shift in Moscow? They characteristically put it that way, for they have been long deceived and befuddled by "liberal" pundits in and out of the Government who have too long overestimated Soviet strength and underestimated potentialities of internal Russian trouble.

HUMAN EVENTS went to a genuine expert who has been right for many years in calling the turn on such events in Soviet land — Eugene Lyons, author of our recent article "The Coming Russian Revolution" (HUMAN EVENTS, June 15, 1957).

> **"What's at the bottom of it all," Lyons told HUMAN EVENTS, "is the people of Russia. The ousting of Molotov *et al* demonstrates the increasing weakness of the Soviet setup and the growing resistance of the Russian people to their Communist masters."**

The significant pattern of recent years, says Lyons, is evident in the Janus-faced attitude of the brand new Khrushchev administration: (1) On the one hand, is shows dictatorial contempt for the people in that Khrushchev and his friends never sought to let the people in on the internal struggle, never sought to enlist their interest and aid. (2) On the other hand, the new administration already manifests fear of and desire to placate the Russian people. For in-

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. • Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stance, immediately after the successful coup, Khrushchev gave relief to the peasants from delivery of products from their little home-owned plots; and started talking of "more meat and more milk" etc., for the workers.

Does the victory of Khrushchev denote weakness or strength of the Soviet setup? Lyons scoffed at the claims of the usual choir of "liberal commentators" in the U.S. who claim it meant "strength." He points to the role of Zhukov in the purge — or rather to the propaganda which the Khrushchev regime now disseminates concerning the backing it says it gets from Zhukov and the Red Army. Did Stalin — Lyons asks — ever have to do this? Did he ever make a big point of the support of the Red Army or its commanders when he staged one of his purges? The late "Great Khan" obviously never found it the least bit necessary.

How can one argue that this recent governmental overturn indicates strength — asks Lyons — when the new regime seeks to bolster its prestige by stressing its association with Marshal Zhukov? How can strength be claimed, when the regime itself has to reveal its serious internal dissension with Molotov and his friends?

Finally, according to Lyons, this exploitation of Zhukov springs from the regime's fear of the people. When the Moscow radio propagandists emphasize the support of Zhukov and the Red Army, they are in effect warning the people: "Don't get too many ideas of freedom," and "With the Red Army we have the force to stop you if you go too far."

Many on the Hill recognize the force of such arguments and draw the conclusion that the United States in its policy towards Russia should eschew all appeasement and seek to give aid and comfort to the freedom forces behind the Iron Curtain, in hopes of an eventual overturn of the tyranny of communism.

As one key Republican, Representative Lawrence Smith (R.-Wis.), veteran member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, put it today: "The firm spirit Dulles showed in his recent speech barring diplomatic relations and trade with the Red Chinese regime, itself suffering from grave internal dissension — that is the way to deal with Soviet Russia and its satellites."

An article by Lyons on Khrushchev is scheduled for publication in the *Reader's Digest*, September number.

Economy: The popular demand for Budget reduction which began five months ago scored one of its biggest triumphs in the past few days, when President Eisenhower ordered his Cabinet to cut back spending approximately $2 billion in the present (1958) fiscal year, which started July 1. This would bring down '58 spending to the level of '57 spending and represents a striking surrender by the Eisenhower Administration to popular demand. *The Wall Street Journal* (July 10) got an exclusive break on the story, reproducing the text of the order itself.

Perhaps the most important factor in this *volte-face*, says the *Journal*, is "the widespread public economy demand." The paper indicates that it expects that Congress will finally have chopped off about $4 billion from the President's Budget and this may well limit further the spending in the fiscal year just beginning. All this projects a picture directly contrary to that presented almost daily by the spenders and most of the press, who have been predicting even higher spending this year, whether the Budget is cut or not.

The news draws enthusiastic comment from economizers on Capitol Hill whose spirits have sagged recently because constituents have slackened off in their letter drive demanding cuts — with the result that the spenders have started to raise appropriations voted on some bills. Especially, say observers in the Capital, will this news embolden a renewed movement to cut foreign aid.

This week the House Foreign Affairs Committee reported out favorably the foreign aid authorization (setting a ceiling on aid), but with a strong bipartisan minority report protesting the majority's okay of the act and declaring that the bill "represents a further abdication of the Congressional responsibility and control over the foreign aid program despite increasing and incontrovertible evidence of waste and inefficiency in administration and execution." It means, said the minority group, "pouring billions of American tax dollars into programs of doubtful validity."

A fight on the floor against the bill (which cuts about $400 million from the Senate authorization) is expected to develop — not only to cut the total but also to cut the $1.5 billion three-year commitment for an "international development fund," which in all likelihood will never be repaid, although it is described as a loan. Finally, the Appropriations Committees of the two chambers are expected to pare down the foreign aid requests much further.

Public sentiment against spending and for cuts has not really receded, but is only "out of focus," say observers on the Hill. Judging by the mail to members of Congress, the public is now mainly steamed up against the Supreme Court and some of the letters — while reiterating demands for Budget cutting — place main emphasis on demands "to do something about the dictatorial Court." Thus the public indignation is "bifurcated" and much impact on Congressional action is blunted. Additionally, much of the public actually believes or assumes that great strides continue to be made in cutting the Budget — since the real situation isn't adequately described in the press.

Civil Rights: It is openly acknowledged in the Capital that, in the current "civil rights" struggle, Republican Senators are striving to make inroads on the Negro vote for 1958 and 1960. Students of vote trends, however, confront Republicans with a pessimistic analysis: today, the Republican party symbolizes conservatism, traditional Americanism, limited government; the Democrats have come to symbolize the opposite. The wave of the future, both within the GOP and in the Nation as a whole (see the recent Young Republican Convention), is toward traditional Republican principles, and Republican

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

strength lies in tapping the natural conservatism of the American people.

Yet, in their scramble for the Negro vote, Republicans seem prepared to junk the traditional bulwark of limited government — states' rights. In doing so, they run the risk of creating another batch of "stay-at-homes" who "don't care who wins" — and thus the risk of shattering the coalition of conservative elements in the population that form the basis of their strength.

And what, ask the analysts, will be their gains in terms of the Negro vote? Negro voting trends show that the Republican Presidential ticket, between 1952 and 1956, did make gains in areas with substantial Negro populations — presumably because of its pro-"civil rights" stance. But those gains were "marginal" — rarely exceeding ten per cent; and, in the most crucial Negro districts, they did not result in victory.

A study by the Washington research organization, *Congressional Quarterly*, discloses that, in the Nation's three largest Negro districts, switches to Eisenhower were insufficient to carry them against Stevenson. In New York's 16th District (Harlem), Eisenhower, supported by Congressman Adam Clayton Powell, scored his largest gain over 1952 — 16.6 per cent. Yet Stevenson carried the district.

In 35 heavily Negro districts outside the South, Eisenhower received 42 per cent of the vote in 1952, 47 per cent in 1956.

The conclusion drawn by trend analysts: the Negro vote was not a determining factor in Eisenhower's victory. (In Southern states where Eisenhower made large increases in Negro support, he also achieved heavy percentages among conservative white Southerners).

For the Republican party as a whole, the vote totals in 1956 offered even less promise: GOP Congressional candidates made no net gain at all in the Negro vote; their share of the ballots in the 35 districts remained at 41 per cent.

On the whole, Negroes tend to vote their "economic" interests more than their alleged "race" interests. The Negro vote, it is believed, will swing consistently to the party that promises the most relief, public housing, and old age pensions — all specialties of the Democratic party. Statistics show that the lowest income Negro precincts were the most faithful to the "grab bag" party — the Democrats.

The Negro vote, analysts conclude from these figures, is at best a source of marginal gains. It will not swing its allegiance radically from the Democrats to the Republicans. Thus the question posed to vote-seeking GOP solons: is the outside chance of picking up marginal percentages among Negro voters worth the risk of shattering the conservative coalition?

Inside the McClellan Committee: Behind recent published reports — that a reorganization of the work of the famous McClellan Labor Rackets group was under consideration — lies an interesting story of "rebellion from the right." For Republicans on the committee are on the rampage.

It is well known in Senate corridors that for some time the GOP members of the McClellan Committee have been chafing at what they considered a "biased" policy of the Committee Counsel, Robert Kennedy, brother of the Democratic Senator from Massachusetts (who is a committee member). So far, big fireworks have been exploded only under Dave Beck and Jimmy Hoffa of the Teamsters Union, both of whom have played with the GOP. But the McClellan Committee has brought out publicly nothing on the "liberal" unions in the AFL or about the CIO, particularly Walter Reuther and his UAW — unions identified with the Democrats.

Yet many of the protests against the exactions of the labor bosses from long-suffering union members are directed at these "liberal" pro-Democratic party elements of the labor movement, as well as against the Teamsters (see "The Workers Speak," by M. Stanton Evans, in Article Section II of this issue). For the first few months of the Beck exposures, Republicans held their peace. But in recent weeks, a GOP revolt has been brewing.

This revolt finds expression, in public, in the demands for reorganization of the committee staff and creation of "task forces," each under an Assistant Counsel (independent of Robert Kennedy) reporting directly to the committee as a whole.

Republicans claim that young Kennedy runs a "one-man operation" which makes for inefficiency and "other things." By the latter, they mean the concentration of attention exclusively on Beck and Hoffa (as mentioned above). And the GOP members want these special task forces to push the following:

(1) An inquiry into the Kohler strike — the story of Reuther's terror and his massive boycott.

(2) Inquiry into the United Steel Workers and charges that its President, David McDonald, utilized union funds and organization to re-elect himself against rank-and-file rebellion.

(3) Inquiry into use of union funds for political purposes — mainly to help Democrats.

For failure to push such inquiries, Republicans blame Counsel Kennedy — claiming that he is playing politics to help his brother, whose campaign for the Presidency in '60 is one of the major political phenomena of today. It would be difficult — Republicans point out — for Senator Kennedy to win the Democratic nomination without approval of Walter Reuther. Also, it would be surprising if there were no connection between all of this and the obvious fact that Democratic Senate leadership (dominated by Southerners like McClellan) is helping to advance Senator Kennedy's ambitions for the Presidency.

If McClellan and the Democrats fail to satisfy the demands of the "rebels on the right," it would not be unexpected if the Republicans publicly point out some things they fume about in private now. Such as: McClellan on the Government Operations Committee back in 1954 raised a big furor over Senator McCarthy's counsel on that committee — the contro-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

versial Roy Cohn. Then the Democrats claimed it was Cohn who ran a "one-man operation." Cohn, say the Republicans, was a very mild and timid operator of that committee compared with the "boss role" which Counsel Robert Kennedy plays in the "labor rackets" committee today.

Democratic Scandals: Just when its fortunes seem to be so low that they could get no lower, the party's "liberals" plunge it into new depths of confusion — so runs this week's comment on the floundering Democratic party. The Democrats, woefully short of Presidential timber (see HUMAN EVENTS for June 8), have been trying to build up "fresh, young" personalities for the battle of 1960. Considered among the most glamorous and promising of these "political juveniles" has been New Jersey's youthful (just turned 49) Governor Robert B. Meyner.

Now, Democrats are losing their bullish notions about Meyner stock, as New Jersey insurance scandals, involving millions of dollars, unfold. The rising tide of public indignation has enveloped Meyner state appointees Charles R. Howell, Commissioner of Banking and Insurance, and Grover C. Richman, Attorney General, and is lapping at the feet of Meyner himself.

The facts of the scandal, as unearthed by investigators of the New Jersey State Law Enforcement Council, have revealed embezzlements and other "irregular practices" in New Jersey insurance companies, and have provoked harsh criticism of the Meyner regime.

State Senator Malcolm S. Forbes, who will oppose Meyner for the Governorship this fall, has charged that the scandals, involving "between $3,000,000 and $4,000,000 among New Jersey insurance companies had been covered up with the knowledge of . . . Meyner." Forbes has demanded that Howell and Richman be dismissed from their offices.

The *Newark Evening News,* reviewing the scandals, commented that, "if this is the way irregularities are covered up, it is time for action at the highest levels. No organization, no executive, is bigger than the state, which means all the people."

Education Front: Plans for the most heavily financed "education" lobby ever seen in this country have been adopted by the National Education Association (NEA).

Meeting in annual convention in Philadelphia on the 100th anniversary of its organization, the NEA approved plans of its leadership for an expanded program of "educating" the public to alleged needs of school systems and teachers.

To provide wherewithal for the program, it doubled the annual dues for its million-plus members (703,000 claimed directly, plus an additional 300,000 indirectly through affiliates), boosting them from $5 to $10.

Among items for which the additional income will go, will be doubling — to $200,000 — the budget of the NEA "legislative committee" (read "lobby") maintained at Washington headquarters to work in behalf of various Federal education programs, primarily Federal aid.

Another half million dollars will be used for what the NEA euphemistically calls "public relations"; this means educating the public about problems facing the educational system, says NEA, although skeptics translate it to mean propagandizing the public in behalf of Federal aid. Radio, television and all other available media will be used in this effort.

Additional sums will be used to expand the NEA field staff, for organizational and educational purposes, and to finance cooperative programs with other groups (all pro-Federal aid) such as PTA's.

One other action taken by the NEA convention raised many eyebrows: adoption of a provision giving its Executive Committee authority to "censure, suspend or expel a member." No precise definition has yet been made of grounds for such action. NEA officials say it will be aimed solely against those who bring disrepute to the teaching profession. Some observers wonder whether it may be extended to provide discipline against teachers with the temerity to oppose Federal aid.

The Federal aid bill itself, meanwhile, is the subject of hearings before the House Rules Committee. Speaker Sam Rayburn is reported to be urging House consideration of the bill; he is lukewarm toward it himself, but does not want his Democratic leadership placed in a position of having prevented a House vote.

Present indications are that if the measure comes before the House, it will be defeated, as it was last year. If it should pass, however, it would be in shape for Senate consideration early next year, which would mean a heated showdown between pro- and anti-Federal aid advocates; no Senate action is contemplated this year, in view of the developing "civil rights" debate.

Letter from PROFESSOR JOHN R. BEISHLINE, Chairman, Department of Management, The University of Texas: "Many thanks to my good friend, Frank deGanahl, for the gift subscription to HUMAN EVENTS for another year. I read each issue avidly and I do not know of any other publication that gives me the 'inside dope' in such clear fashion as does this one. I always utilize it regularly in my classes, as you know. I have high hopes that I am developing some right thinking people as a consequence."

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.
Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.
By first class mail, $12 a year, by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.
Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.
Bound Annual Volume with complete Index $15. Only 1955 and 1956 Volumes are available.
The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, M. STANTON EVANS

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly *newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and* taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1957.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XIV, No. 28 HUMAN EVENTS July 3, 1957

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

Article Section I

"CIVIL RIGHTS" AGAINST THE CONSTITUTION

By REPRESENTATIVE NOAH M. MASON
Republican of Illinois

NOW BEFORE the Senate is the so-called "civil rights" bill, which has the backing of "liberal" Democrats and many members of my own party. The measure now being debated in the Senate was passed by the House, June 18, by a vote of 286-126. It provides that the Justice Department can obtain Federal Court injunctions against persons charged with violations of "civil rights," and that anyone ignoring such injunctions will be subject to "contempt" proceedings — without benefit of jury trial. While this latter provision has proved to be the most controversial part of the "civil rights" measure, other issues — equally profound — are involved.

As a Republican from a Northern state, and one who opposed this legislation in the House of Representatives, I should like to inspect what I believe to be the key issue in the controversy over "civil rights": the relentless encroachment of the Federal Government upon the constitutional prerogatives of the states.

We have all heard the old saying, "The cure can be worse than the disease." In connection with the proposed "civil rights" legislation, that saying may well apply. We might exchange states' rights and human rights for a "civil rights" program and be much worse off after the exchange. Let us not barter the real blessings we now enjoy for the fancied or fictitious blessings that may be a part of the mirage known as "civil rights."

Habits, customs, obligations are much more effective than any "civil rights" program implemented by Federal laws. Laws are not particularly efficient. Custom is much more effective than any law because it polices itself. A law has little chance of being enforced if it does not have the approval and support of the majority of the people affected.

Prohibition was once the law of the land. It was a part of our written Constitution. However, because it did not reflect the conscience of the majority of our people, it was not enforceable from a practical standpoint and it had to be repealed.

EDMUND BURKE once said, "I know of no way to bring an indictment against a whole people." Of course, that statement applies in a democracy such as ours. It does not apply under a despot; it does not apply in Russia.

Any attempt to enforce a Federal law — or a so-called Supreme Court decision — upon 48 States that have different conditions, different customs, different social standards, and different personal consciences is simply an effort to indict, to arraign, to try a whole nation, a whole section, a whole state. It just cannot be done in a democracy; it can only be done under a dictator. Is that what the civil rights program proposes to do? Must we lose our personal freedom? Must we surrender our guaranteed states' rights in order to establish a program of civil rights? Isn't the cure much worse than the disease?

Laws reflect reform; they never induce reform. Laws that violate or go contrary to the customs of a community never bring about social peace and harmony. Our times call for patience, for moderation, for gradual evolution — not revolution by Federal law or by Supreme Court fiat.

Why then should the Federal Government violate states' rights by assuming functions that belong to the states? Wouldn't that be going contrary to the supreme law of the land — the Constitution?

When the Federal Constitution was before the states for ratification, four of the states demanded guaranties that "freedom of the press, of speech, and of religion" would be a part of the Constitution. Nine of the states insisted that "states' rights" be guaranteed. And so the Tenth Amendment was made a part of the Bill

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. • Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Rights — so that the Federal Government would be restrained from ever interfering with human liberty and human dignity.

The first nine amendments in the Bill of Rights deal with the rights of the people, God-given rights; the Tenth Amendment deals with the powers of the Federal Government. It limits those powers. It says to the President, to the Supreme Court, and to the Congress: "You may do what the Constitution specifically says you may do, but you may do no more. Those powers that are not given you are either reserved to the states or they belong to the people." That is what the Tenth Amendment spells out, and we must not forget it in our desire to establish "civil rights."

In 1952, speaking at Des Moines as a candidate for the Presidency, General Eisenhower said: "The Federal Government did not create the states of this Republic. The states created the Federal Government. The creation should not supersede the creator. For if the states lose their meaning our entire system of government loses its meaning and the next step is the rise of the centralized national state in which the seeds of autocracy can take root and grow."

At the Conference of Governors in Seattle, early in 1953, President Eisenhower declared:

> **"I am here because of my indestructible conviction that unless we preserve in this country the place of state government with the power of authority, the responsibilities, and the revenues necessary to discharge those responsibilities, then we are not going to have America as we have known it. We will have some other form of government."**

At this year's Governor's Conference in Williamsburg, Virginia, June 24, the President explicity reaffirmed this statement, and warned that developments were afoot which would "transgress our most cherished principles of government." He referred to one "cherished principle" in particular: "Those who would be and would stay free must stand eternal watch against excessive concentration of power in Government."

CAN ANYTHING be clearer than these words of President Eisenhower himself? The President states that the destruction of constitutional states' rights will sow the seeds of autocracy, bring about some other form of government in America, and force us to establish a dictatorship. I am in complete agreement with these sentiments of the President, and I find it impossible to read in them anything but a mandate to defeat the proposed "civil rights" legislation. For that measure is just such a concentration of Governmental power, just such an invasion of state prerogatives, as the President warns against.

I had the good fortune to serve on the Commission of Intergovernmental Relations under the chairmanship of Dean Manion, one of the greatest constitutional lawyers in America. The one great principle he emphasized was that the purpose of the American Government is to preserve and protect our God-given rights; that the American Government is a mechanism for the protection of human rights; that civil rights are rights provided by law that definitely come under the jurisdiction of the states, not under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government; that whenever the Federal Government undertakes to establish or set up a program of "civil rights," it must of necessity encroach upon states' rights and upon God-given human rights.

Can we afford to do that? Dare we violate the Constitution by ignoring the following clear and concise language from the Tenth Amendment?

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

Send me.....reprints of "'CIVIL RIGHTS' AGAINST THE CONSTITUTION" at $..... ☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15¢ (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½¢ per copy; for airmail, add 1¢ per copy.

Prices of 4-page articles or news sections are as follows: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $10

Name.....

Street.....

City.....Zone.....State.....

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XIV, No. 28 HUMAN EVENTS July 13, 1957

Article Section II

THE WORKERS SPEAK

Rank and File Protests Labor Tyranny

By M. STANTON EVANS

FOR THOUSANDS of working men and women across the United States, February 26, 1957, began an era of hope. On that day opened the hearings of the Senate's "Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field" – known more simply as the McClellan Committee.

When reporters Wallace Turner and William Lambert of the *Portland Oregonian* took the stand to begin the proceedings, they started a chain of testimony that would, in the following months, bring such titans of unionism as Dave Beck and Jimmy Hoffa, of the mammoth Brotherhood of Teamsters, crashing to earth. Reporter Lambert summarized the thoughts of many long-time critics of "bossism" when he testified: "The only hope of exposing a disgraceful condition which impairs the political and economic freedom of a city like Portland rests in such a Congressional body as this one . . ."

The "disgraceful condition," it soon appeared, was limited neither to the city of Portland nor to the Teamsters Union. The appeals of the workers themselves indicate that the abuses fostered by "bossism" are widespread – extending in all directions from those explored to date.

Of the vast quantity of mail received by the McClellan Committee, more than half of that identifiable as to union affiliation is from union members. Those letters examined by this reporter – under conditions stipulated by the Committee – mentioned a variety of unions with impartiality. Such "liberal" unions as the International Ladies' Garment Workers and the United Automobile Workers most decidedly were not omitted.

In particular, Walter Reuther's UAW has received prominent notice. Staff members who handle the letters as they arrive state that the mail on UAW is building up appreciably; and that – while there is no exact comparison of the volume of complaints – Reuther's union unquestionably ranks among the leaders. (At the time of this interview, the Teamsters, by rough estimate, still rest comfortably in first place.)

Gaining in prominence as a topic for criticism and inquiry is the three-year-old UAW strike against the Kohler Company. People all over the United States have written the McClellan Committee about the bitter dispute that has turned the small village of Kohler, Wis., into a cockpit of violence. Accordingly, and in line with the request of Committee member Barry Goldwater, a review of the events at Kohler is under way.

The disease of "bossism," far from being localized, seems more in the nature of an epidemic. One staffmember stated: "It's hard – almost impossible – to think of a union that hasn't been mentioned in the letters we get."

PINNED BENEATH the almost limitless power of the union bosses, laboring men have found most channels for remedial action closed to them. They could not move through the machinery of the union itself, for that machinery is tightly controlled. They could not move through the courts, for that road is long, arduous, and expensive; an added hazard is that labor unions, under their special dispensation, are not – as Dean Roscoe Pound puts it – "legally tangible entities." And so the letters have poured in.

A foundry worker in a Midwestern city, reading of the exposure of abuses in the Teamsters Union, wrote the McClellan Committee:

> **I want to express the appreciation of many workers here for the job that you are doing. Our own union is completely crooked. Meetings are never called, and no accounting is ever made of where our money goes. They're railroading through a check-off now that is plain robbery. I hope that the committee can get out here to look into the situation. There are plenty of us who will back you up. The head of our union is spending our dues money for politicking . . .**

This, in its broad outline, is a representative complaint. When such letters arrive at the committee's offices, they are read carefully and answered; then possible leads are sifted and tracked down.

This procedure is a full-time job. Staffmen estimate that, in its four months of operation, the Committee has received more than 40,000 letters – well over 300 a day. Significantly, the volume has not diminished as the hearings wear on. The result is that the Committee, which embarked into relative uncertainty when it opened its hearings, is now fueled to continue at full steam for a long time to come. The investigators know that the public, and the workers, want a thorough airing of Big Labor's dirty linen.

The abuses complained of by the rank and file primarily concern "tyranny" – functioning at two levels: control of the members by the business agent of the local, and control of the local union by the "international" office–with policies dictated from New York, Chicago or some other distant center of power.

Here is an excerpt from a letter written by a worker in Los Angeles, as furnished by the Committee staff (each letter has been disguised to protect the author's identity):

> **The union wanted to raise our dues again, and we voted unanimously against it. But when I got my next pay check I found the increase had been taken out of it.**

And another from a laborer in Chicago:

> **The union bosses appoint our shop stewards. We don't have a thing to say about it. If a man quits or gets fired he can't collect his pension money, although it's been deducted right along . . .**

A worker in a border city charges that "this local is run like a dictatorship. The leaders engage in open racketeering . . . I am not afraid of them and their goons, and if your committee comes to our town, I am ready and willing to help out with an investigation."

A broad sampling of such excerpts reveals a definite pattern of abuse. A surprising number of business agents, for example, seem to have mansions, expensive clothes and winter homes in Florida. All, the

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. • Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

letters charge, purchased with money taken from the workers' pockets. The recurring complaints involve check-offs; selection of stewards; intimidation of dissenters; use of funds for political purposes; strike violence; luxurious salaries of officers; collusion between officials and management, or between officials and local politicians; no means of appealing grievances; arbitrary expulsions; Communist influence.

Complaints about the handling of money, in various forms, are among the most numerous. One letter from a worker in a large industrial city states:

> **A small group controls our local, collecting three per cent of our wages. We never get anything back. On one job they skimmed off upwards of a million bucks in assessments. And we've got more sense than to ask where it goes . . .**

Other complaints include the charge that "the union hits new members for hundreds of dollars in 'back assessments.' They say that new members have to pay these fees, running back 20 years or so, even though they didn't belong to the union then." A union member in Pennsylvania writes that "we found some Communists in our local and reported them to our central office. Then we found $1,012.43 in union funds was missing. The central office tried to bribe us into not stirring up a ruckus." A worker in a large Southern city says: "A lot of money has vanished since we elected our business agent. Ninety thousand dollars that we had in our treasury has disappeared and has not been accounted for."

The union members also have suggestions for remedying these abuses: "I know I speak for a lot of other union members when I say that unions should be forced to issue annual financial statements and to pay income taxes . . ."

An ominous note runs through practically all the letters to the Select Committee. Although some workers declare, "you can use my name, I'm not afraid of the goons," most are fearful. It is apparent that writing to the Committee, in itself, is often a dangerous step – born of desperation. The refrain of much of the correspondence is: "Please treat this confidentially." "I could get in a lot of trouble if certain people saw this letter." Inevitably, some of the letters are anonymous ("because I don't want to get my head smashed in").

FROM EVERY PAGE detailing tyranny, mishandling of funds, contempt for democratic procedure, there leers the face of violence. This, clearly, is the rock on which the power of union oligarchy is founded. Representative of letters from all over the United States are the following excerpts:

> **There are no elections of officers in our union. Whenever we have a meeting it's stacked with goons.**
>
> * * *
>
> **If we speak at meetings we're intimidated. I got beat up last year for expressing my views, and I wasn't the only one . . .**
>
> * * *
>
> ***We have had our acid-throwing incidents here too . . .***
>
> * * *
>
> **On January 8, 1949, I was beaten up by one of the goons. Then they tried to fire me, but let him keep working . . .**
>
> * * *
>
> **While they were organizing the place, they used every kind of violence. They smashed windows and shot the tires off trucks . . . One of the men was jumped by four goons and beaten up. He had to have fourteen stitches . . . The local police seem afraid to do anything.**

Beatings, shootings, acid-throwing; destruction of property, sabotaged machinery, paint-bombs – these are by now familiar forms of union violence. Episodes like the Kohler strike and the blinding of Victor Riesel have dramatized such terror before the public. But there is another form of "violence," which – relentless though silent – presses forward to crush all opposition. This is economic terror – the power to take away a man's livelihood, at will; to deny him access to his trade unless he trims to the union line. Such power is conferred on the bosses by the device of compulsory union membership.

"None of us," writes a laborer in Washington, "wanted to join the union. We had good working conditions and the pay was square . . . It was forced on us by a campaign of violence."

A Northern worker writes:

> **I belong to a union only because I have to. I had to join if I wanted to work. So, even though I know what they are doing with my money, I can't quit the union unless I quit my job.**

Particularly galling to such captive members is the use of their dues money for political purposes. "It burns me up," states a laborer in a Middle Atlantic city, "that I have to pay dues to a bunch of guys who use the money to support politicians that I'm against." And a worker on the Pacific Coast has a similar complaint: "We are forced to make contributions to the unions' political fund. If we don't, it's too bad."

Thus the bosses, through political pressure, obtained the monopoly of the union shop; then they use their monopoly power to keep the political pressure at full strength. The big loser in this vicious circle is the individual worker:

> **I'm compelled to belong to this outfit because of the "union shop." I'm sure that, if we had a choice, hardly anybody but the officials would be members of this union.**

So writes a worker in the Midwest. In like manner, every aspect of compulsory union membership is scored: the power of expulsion; the check-off system; the political use of dues money; above all, the denial of free choice. And, in spite of the steady drumbeat of propaganda supplied by Walter Reuther & friends, the workers know that there is a way out.

"I would like," writes a union member in a large industrial city, "to see a Federal 'right-to-work' law enacted. That is the only way we can be saved from tyranny."

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

Send me.....reprints of "THE WORKERS SPEAK"

at $..... ☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15¢ (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½¢ per copy; for airmail, add 1¢ per copy.

Prices of 4-page articles or news sections are as follows: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $10

Name.....

Street.....

City.....Zone.....State.....

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED